52



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/458,321	12/10/1999	Yong Ho Son	533/040	8721
26291 75	590 06/16/2004		EXAM	INER
,	TERSON & SHERIDAN	SRIVASTAV	SRIVASTAVA, VIVEK	
FIRST FLOOR	BURY AVE, STE 100		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SHREWSBUR	Y, NJ 07702	2611	22	
			DATE MAILED, 06/16/200	. 20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

¢ .						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/458,321	SON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Vivek Srivastava	2611				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 A</u>	April 2004.					
·	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 10-13,15-18 and 20-29 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv ou (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that Sahai fails to disclose navigational assets comprising a plurality of assets, said applets being stored at the service provider.

The Examiner respectfully submits that the plurality of URL's have an associated a plurality of applets, thus Sahai still reads on the Amended limitation. Further, it should be noted that the URL's are transmitted from the service provider.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

- I. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 – 13, 15 – 18, and 20 – 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahai (6,594,699) in view of Shaw et al (6,104,392 – previously cited) and Utsumi (6,195,677 – previously cited).

Regarding claim 10, Sahai discloses a system for capability based multimedia streaming over a network. In the video-on-demand (see col 2 lines 5-7) system of Sahai, a capability level of a TV settop terminal (see col 3 lines 25-27) is determined and appropriate Java applets and

Art Unit: 2611

versions of video programming are provided (see col 7 lines 57 – col 7 line 9, see col 4 lines 34-38). It should be noted that Sahai discloses storing video clips in both MPEG1 and MPEG2 formats (see col 6 lines 17-21) and thus discloses the claimed versions of video programs. It should be noted that the URL or applets inherently comprises video, graphical and control information to enable display and interactivity in the graphical user interface (see col 4 lines 9-15). Sahai further disclose packet based transmissions (see col 2 lines 46-50). Sahai further discloses that URL's having associated applets are stored and transmitted from the service provider (see col 6 line 57 – col 7 line 9).

Although Sahai discloses a settop terminal and suggests other type of networks could be used, Sahai fails to disclose selectively tuning and downconverting video content and assets transmitted via one a plurality of transmission channels. It would have been obvious to modify Sahai to use an existing CATV network for transmission on a one of a plurality of transmission channels and thus include the tuning and downconverting to provide the transmission of the video content and assets over an existing high bandwidth network.

Sahai fails to disclose determining the capability level of the distribution network. Shaw teaches determining the capability levels of a client device and the network (see col 11 lines 21-45). It would have been obvious including determining the capability level of the network would have enabled bandwidth considerations which would also include preventing saturation of the bandwidth. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Sahai to include the claimed limitation to prevent saturation of the bandwidth.

Sahai fails to disclose the claimed determining the capability level of the STT at the service provider equipment. Utsumi teaches determining the capability level of terminals and the

Art Unit: 2611

communication network at a server (see col 15 lines 46 - col 16 line 50) and also teaches a data processing unit at the server manages providing data to a plurality of terminals via a plurality of communications networks (see col 6 lines 6-16). It would have been obvious determining the capability level of each STT and communication network would provide determination of capabilities from a single central location in lieu of a plurality of STT locations which would also result in a reduction is cost associated with STT for determining the capability level and reduced upstream bandwidth required for transmitting the capability level upstream from the STT to the server each time a request is made for data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sahai to include the claimed determining the capability level of the STT and the network at the service provider equipment to have a centralized location for determining the capability, a reduction in cost associated with each STT and to minimize upstream bandwidth consumption for transmitting upstream from the STT to the server every time a request is made.

Regarding claim 11, Sahai discloses video processing and audio processing capability (see col 3 lines 27-42, col 4 lines 16-25).

Regarding claims 12 and 13, the combination of Sahai, Shaw and Utsumi discloses the claimed limition, wherein Shah discloses the claimed asset data base (see col 8 lines 39-44, col 9 line 56 - col 10 line 18, col 11 lines 31-45) and also discloses the claimed selecting from the asset database, an asset having associated with it the capability level of the STT requiring the asset (col 11 lines 31-45, col 9 line 56 - col 10 line 3).

Regarding claims 15 and 16, the combination of Sahai, Shaw and Utsumi disclose the claimed limitations. Sahai disclose providing a plurality of applets to a requesting STT as claimed (see col. 6 line 57 – col. 7 line 9). Shaw discloses control information (hyperlinks for the Java applets, see col 8 lines 38-59) are transmitted based indicative of navigational assets

Art Unit: 2611

within the database (col 11 lines 31-45, col 9 line 56 - col 10 line 3) having with them an associated capability level of the STT receiving the initial navigational asset (col 11 lines 31-45, col 9 lines 56 - col 10). Shaw also discloses navigational assets comprise applets (col 8 lines 38-46) including video information, graphic information and control information (col 8 lines 38-59) wherein applets are stored at the server (col 8 lines 38-44) and provided to a user when a user interacts with the control information needed at the STT indicative of the need for applets (col 8 lines 31-59, control information met by logical operators needed for hyperlinking to web page).

As to claim 17, claim 17 is met by that discussed in claim 10. Claim 17, further recites "each of the set top terminals have a common video information processing architecture, one of a plurality of control architectures and one of a plurality of graphics processing architectures" which is met by Sahai since all the set top terminals have a GUI (see col 4 lines 9-15). Claim 17 further recites "wherein nægigator assets are optimized to each of the possible STT capability levels to provide a plurality of respective navigator assets, each of the respective navigator assets having an associated with it a respective STT capability level" which is met by the combination of Sahai, Shaw and Utsumi, wherein Shaw also discloses adapting and optimizing Internet protocol links (navigational assets) according the performance of the settop (col 11 lines 21-35, col 9 lines 56-67).

As to claim 18, the combination of Sahai, Shaw and Utsumi discloses the claimed limitation, wherein Shaw discloses optimizing provided information in 'real time' (col 8 lines 38-45, 'real time' met by sending a dynamically created web page to user when requested).

Claim 20 - 23 are met by that discussed above.

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Sahia, Shaw and Utsumi discloses the claimed limitation, wherein Shaw discloses providing graphical assets to be provided to STT (col 8 lines

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/458,321

Art Unit: 2611

38-55) wherein the assets are adapted to the capability levels of the STT (col 8 lines 38-55, col 11 lines 31-45, col 9 line 56 - col 10 line 18) and wherein the information indicative of the graphics processing capabilities of the STT are stored in a database (col 8 lines 39-44, col 9 line 56 - col 10 line 18, col 11 lines 31-45).

Considering claim 25, the combination of Sahai, Shaw and Utsumi discloses the claimed wherein each of the associated STT has associated with it control capability (col 8 lines 30-35, control capability met by 'logical operators' and 'operations'), wherein session controller provides control related assets to the STT (col 8 lines 38-63, control related assets met by hyperlinking information for controlling access to web pages) in accordance with the control capability associated with each STT being stored in the database (col 8 lines 39-44, col 9 line 56 - col 10 line 18, col 11 lines 31-45, the limitation is met since each STT has a control capability, and the control capabilities are stored in the database).

Claims 26 - 29 are met by that discussed above.

Conclusion

II. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Legall et al - searching a television guide via the Internet

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2611

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308- 5399 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Srivastava whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 4038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andy Faile, can be reached at (703) 305 - 4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 3900.

VS

6/11/04

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA PRIMARY EXAMINER